INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

FACULTY SENATE, 2014-2015

January 22, 2015

3:30pm, Dede III

**Minutes**

Members Present: R. Guell, S. Lamb, C. MacDonald, C. Olsen, A. Anderson, C. Ball, K. Berlin, K. Bolinger, L. Borrero, P. Bro, B. Bunnett, T. Foster, E. Hampton, D. Hantzis, M. Haque, M. Harmon, B. Kilp, A. Kummerow, I. Land, K. Lee, R. Lugar, D. Malooley, S. McCaskey, A. Morales, C. Paterson, J. Pommier, D. Richards, R. Schneirov, V. Sheets, E. Southard, M. Sterling

Members Absent: L. Phillips, K. Yousif

Ex-Officio Present: R. Crumrin, R. English, K. Hill-Clarke, L. Maule, L. Maurer, J. Murray, B. Smith, R. Torrence, J. Turman

Ex-Officio Absent: President D. Bradley, Provost J. Maynard, O. Finley

Guests: C. Blevens, R. Gonser, D. Jennermann, D. McKee, J. Powers, S. Powers, L. Spence

1. Memorial Resolution: Cornelius Canon, read by D. Jennermann
	1. D. Jennermann: Neal Canon took great interest in the University Honors Program and initiated for it a new course, Introduction to the Performing Arts, whereby students could learn about a wide array of the arts being performed that semester in the area, on and off campus. His approach to that class was “Pure Canon.” Early in the semester he invited the class to his home to meet his family, and to share in some conversation, games, and food. Neal brought his own style to his approach in teaching: involve students in the “backstage” aspects of any featured event. He sought their understanding and appreciation, and students then asked questions whenever they might arise. Over the years many students took and enjoyed those spring semesters with Dr. Canon.

Besides teaching in Honors, Neal regularly taught courses in Humanities, and directed the department’s first Master of Arts thesis on the topic of Romanticism as Seen in the Lives and Works of Byron, Berlioz, and Delacroix. Such vigorous expressions of Romanticism resonated with Dr. Canon’s sense of Humanities that crossed borders and artistic genres, raised serious discussion, and resulted in a fuller appreciation of their place in life. Prior to his service to Indiana State he earned his academic degrees, a B.A. at Mankato State and Ph.D. in Musicology from the University of Minnesota, and served in the United States Army Band. He did further research in Washington, D.C. and in Tübingen, Germany. In spirit he was at one with the upland prairie of which he was born and nourished. He brought upon his return after ISU many gifts and commitments to conservation, music, philosophy, and friendship. He was regarded as outstanding in his field, one who, in the words of Matthew Arnold, “saw life steadily and saw it whole.”

Cornelius “Neal” Baird Canon was born November 1, 1931 at his family farm in Nashville Center, Minnesota to Clarence and Lura (Smith) Canon, and passed away on October 13, 2014 in Northfield, Minnesota. He is survived by his beloved wife, Marvis (Heinemann) Canon, his sweetheart of 70 years; and his children Karen Canon (Tom Haigh), David Canon (Sarah), and Susan Canon (Mike Bull), his sisters Corrine Canon and Margaret Swenson; and grandchildren, Daniel, Nicholas, Neal, Katherine, Katie, Sophia, Kelsey, and James, to all of whom Dr. Canon passed on his passionate love of music.

The College of Arts and Sciences acknowledges Dr. Neal Canon’s dedication to Indiana State University and for enriching the lives of many through his years of teaching in the Humanities department and the University Honors Program.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate of Indiana State University express to the family of Dr. Canon its sincere sympathy and condolences, and that it further express its appreciation for the twenty-seven years of service and dedication to his students, the Humanities department, the American Studies Program, the University Honors Program, the College of Arts and Sciences, and the University.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this testimonial be placed in the minutes of the Faculty Senate and that a copy be transmitted to his family.

1. Administrative Reports:
	1. President D. Bradley: Absent
	2. Provost J. Maynard: Absent
2. Chair Report:
	1. R. Guell: D. Bradley is at the Union Hospital Board of Trustees meeting, and J. Maynard is tending his ill father at this time. I have asked D. McKee to come and update us on the search for a new Provost.
		1. D. McKee: As you know we are in the process of looking for our new Provost; some of the members of the committee are here. I wanted to provide a brief update. We met on January 8 and from that meeting there were 11 candidates selected for an initial round of interviews. Two we will Skype with tomorrow, and the remaining nine will be interviewed next Thursday and Friday at the Indianapolis airport hotel. When we conclude that procedure on January 30, before the committee leaves that day, we will determine a number of candidates to bring to campus. Currently we have five dates in February: 11-13, 15-17, 17-19, 22-24, and 25-27. They will come in the afternoon of the first day, and the second day will be all-day interviews on campus. They will have breakfast with the committee on the final day as well as an Open Forum with faculty and the Executive Committee. We are also setting aside time for our candidates to meet with the respective departments they would be tenured in. I was very pleased with all of our candidates; there is a great deal of diversity represented, which we were very mindful of. We are looking forward to interviewing these candidates and choosing the best fit for ISU. We will make a determination on January 30 of at least three candidates, maybe five, depending on the wishes of the committee.
	2. R. Guell: They have proposed an increase in parking fees that is quite nominal; two dollars for surface parking and four dollars for the garage.
	3. R. Guell: Also, our Temporary Faculty Advocate has stepped down. I have sent an email to all temporary faculty who were on staff in the fall calling for a meeting tomorrow. We will name one as quickly as possible. I have asked to have a procedure in place by which temporary faculty will choose their own representative.
	4. R. Guell: I want to encourage you to start thinking about running for reelection for your Senate seat, if you are eligible, and also for officers and the Executive Committee. I will have more to say about that when we get to it.
	5. R. Guell: R. Toomey and S. Wurtz are in dire need of people to help with the January 31 President’s Scholars Day interviews. If you have any time please send them an email.
	6. R. Guell: For those who don’t know, the Senate asked to reorganize the budget discussion within FEBC, but the President’s refused to take the change in our bylaws to the Board of Trustees and instead substituted what he would accept for faculty and staff by creating a committee of Vice Presidents, himself, and the SGA representatives, Staff Council officers, and Faculty Senate officers that include one member of FEBC. For the last three years we have been running on the 97 percent rule. We have underestimated enrollment by between 10-13 percent over the past five years. These differences are so gigantic as to be irresponsible. I have made a nuisance of myself because the President is demanding we cut another $1 million from campus. We don’t know specific lines, some are empty, but some are filled. We believe we don’t know exactly who they are—we are at the point that tuition net revenues have grown from around $40 million to around $70 million. Dear God, we’ve cut enough. We have enough money.
3. Staff Report: R. Torrence
	1. R. Torrence: We held a Murder Mystery Night last night and raised $1150 for United Way. We have begun taking applications for the Staff Council Scholarship, and are planning an evening in March.
4. SGA Report
	1. O. Finley: Absent
5. Part-Time Temporary Faculty Advocate
	1. Absent
6. Approval of December 4, 2014 Minutes: A. Anderson, M. Harmon. Vote: 30-0-2.
7. Fifteen-Minute Open Discussion
	1. R. Lugar: The staff and faculty benefit for tuition is 80 percent for children up to 10 semesters. If the child does not use the whole 10 semesters, could we consider that those children would be allowed to use them for graduate work? It may encourage children to stay for graduate programs.
		1. R. Guell: I have charged FEBC with precisely that question. J. Maynard and D. Bradley have not immediately objected to it. We will respond to that.
8. Informational Items
	1. Student Evaluation Questions
		1. R. Guell: The committee that put together the list of questions was from the chairs of SAC and FAC as well as E. Hampton and C. Olsen. There were the most animated in their discussions in Exec, holding different viewpoints. These are what we will vote on next time. I wanted to give you an opportunity to read them, consider them, and share your thoughts this session so others may coalesce for thoughtful amendments in February.
			1. C. Paterson: I don’t intend any snark, but they are not questions, these are statements. How does this fit into the system? I assume a Likert Scale, but it’s not been represented in any list that I’ve seen. We should call them “items” rather than questions.
			2. K. Berlin: The students’ biggest complaint this year has been that some of the surveys allowed them to input feedback, and others didn’t. If you went in and adjusted the questions they could give feedback. The option should be included each time.
			3. R. Guell: We have the open-ended items that Exec added on Tuesday…does anyone have any questions/concerns about these?
			4. K. Berlin: If you have negative feedback about an Instructor, what will they say about the best and worst things about the course? Any other comments or statements without saying “what would have helped you learn better” is directive.
			5. A. Kummerow: I agree. These question s are directed, and by having them, must be default questions. I think this is intended for evaluation at the university level. Departments have the ability to put additional questions in, but I think from the university standpoint I just think feedback questions won’t make sense here.
			6. E. Southard: Enthusiasm for the course could certainly apply for distance education. A lot of my discussion is a video response to their online discussions. I think it could apply.
			7. D. Hantzis: I’m sure we discussed the status of open-ended questions at this level. These are the questions everyone will get no matter what else is asked. At this university level we understand the process by which these will be kept means these data are not protected. That is why we didn’t include comment-based questions in what we recommended. We wanted to come as close as possible to mandating that colleges have questions and departments have questions, and at those levels open-ended questions should be included. We agreed there should be open-ended questions at the college, department, and instructor level. Each college should take responsibility for ensuring there are questions but also decide if college-level questions will supplement or substitute department questions.
			8. C. MacDonald: Just to respond to the comment that was made about enthusiasm—we did discuss that a lot in Exec. I am not convinced that every student can judge enthusiasm in a distance course. It’s an important aspect of teaching, but I’m not confident students can judge it in all formats.
			9. B. Bunnett: I attended a presentation made by SGA; they did the things they would like the most to see in their instructors, like “be excited,” “teach a class you would want to attend,” “help students when they don’t get it,” “be clear,” “be available,” “respond to students feedback, email, etc.”
	2. Section 305
		1. D. Hantzis: I was asked to give a progress report because FAC has been working on section 305 since September. We have 31 charges this year. R. Guell has characterized this as the most important section of the Handbook to faculty, and I agree. it defines our identity as a university. Section 305 has 12 sections. There are 166 subsections within them. We have read every word. We have done a lot of work on it for the past three years, and it is indeed a terrible quilt as R. Guell said. We have to create a coherent and logical arrangement. R. Guell did a nice job organizing the sections and handing it off. We did work on some mundane issues in need of correction, filled in gaps, etc. For example, tenure and tenure-track faculty are the only ones referenced in the document. It was originally written assuming all faculty are tenure-track. There are open loops where we made changes but no one is accountable to respond. There is now language to establish new accountability provisions. Also, one College asked that we consider allowing Instructors to be eligible for conditional reappointment and we are proposing that in the first and second years, and the fourth and fifth, and then they are given biennial reviews like other faculty. The Provost is interested in linking promotion to successful 6th year review and we are proposing the rank of Senior Instructor; the Provost indicated promotion would be accompanied by a pay raise. Given that we not have $13 million extra that we didn’t know about, that may be possible. We are bringing attention to exceptional practices so the direct hire policy and the biennial review need to be referred to in the Handbook since they are used. The status of advising is being reviewed in terms of the designation of the domain. One challenge has been responding to the fact that the appointment letter is treated as though it is a description of performance expectations, and now it’s just “please don’t violate NCAA rules” and “we are diverse.” We look to reconcile the sections on right of rebuttal, factual errors, and negative recommendations. Our goal is to meet the new Exec timeline.
9. Elections
	1. Electioneer: V. Sheets. R. Guell, D. Hantzis. Vote: 32-0-0
		1. R. Guell: The Electioneer will ensure ballots are appropriately worded and sent out to faculty. They will work with D. Hantzis and M. Wiant. They will also take care of the voting for both the Constitutional changes as well as the Senate and Exec Elections.
	2. Stats to Consider
		1. One of you came to my office and handed me this document, which I had not done the work to produce, but I had it in my head—the Executive Committee and officers had become over the years the same cast of characters. I am probably one of the six who have occupied 41 percent of the officer positions from 2003-2015, and in order to be an effective body, we need to be a representative and responsible group. The reality is there is no better perch from which to represent the institution than from an officer position. There are hour-long meetings every week with the Provost to talk through every issue there is. You can be almost as influential, or in some cases more so, than a dean can. I hope you will consider running for Exec or an officer position. I will support someone else for chair in hopes that we will have in five years something that will be different from the meeting I had in December that had everyone who had been an officer in the past several years—there were six of us in the room. I believe that is extraordinarily unhealthy for an institution. Even if you don’t believe you are ready for one of these positions, I hope you will actively consider running.
10. GC Item
	1. MS Genetic Counseling: A. Anderson, A. Kummerow. Vote: 32-0-0
		1. R. Gonser: The Genetic Counseling program emerged from Unbounded Possibilities three years ago. We needed ten faculty lines, five in Biology, which would support it as well as five in other areas. There were pockets of faculty across campus that fit curriculum that we looked at. This will be one of only 28 programs in the country. We can look at their curriculum and see we already had many of the courses. We only had to develop four courses for this. Biology faculty have already been hired for it. We met with other departments regarding instruction, and other colleges have been included as well. It’s a two-year, 62-credit program, and we are asking for a minimum GPA of 3.2. Indiana University accepted only 7 students into their program last year. There are 900-1500 new positions to be filled. IU can only accept 6-8 students at a time because there are not enough opportunities for internship in Indy. There are jobs that cannot be filled. The industry is starting to snap up their graduates. Nantex Biotech will need people when they come. There will be space for a clinic in Hux Cancer Center. Peyton Manning Hospital will help us out as well. Two kinds are hospital-based and one is university-based. All students will be paying students.
11. Constitutional Changes
	1. Strike 245.8.5 (and all of its components) from Handbook. A. Anderson, M. Harmon. Vote: 32-0-0
	2. Strike 245.8.6 (and all of its components) from Handbook. A. Anderson, J. Pommier. Vote: 32-0-0
	3. Revise 245.3.4 Regarding the Election of Parliamentarian. A. Anderson, M. Harmon. Vote: 32-0-0
	4. Create 245.3.3.4 Attendance Policy (and renumber accordingly). A. Anderson, A. Kummerow. Vote: 32-0-0
	5. Create 245.9.1.4 Authorization to Make Minor Changes. A. Anderson, A. Kummerow. Vote: 32-0-0
12. Adjournment 4:15pm